



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/867,648	05/31/2001	Nang Kon Kwan	6502.0345	7988
22852	7590	08/11/2004	EXAMINER	
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP 1300 I STREET, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20005			PHAM, KHANH B	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2177	

DATE MAILED: 08/11/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

09/867,648

Applicant(s)

KWAN, NANG KON

Examiner

Khanh B. Pham

Art Unit

2177

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 15 July 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: None.Claim(s) objected to: None.Claim(s) rejected: 1-29.Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: None.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

*Khanh B. Pham*

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

*John E. Breene*  
JOHN BREENE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Claims 1-13, 16-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sinn (US 2002/0166049 A1), hereinafter "Sinn". As per claims 1, 17, 29, Sinn discloses a method and a computer readable medium for validating digital certificates having a server (Fig. 52, element 2076), an Online Certificate Status Protocol responder (element 2072), a certificate authority (element 2084), and a certificate database (element 36) including records associated with digital certificates, comprising:

"receiving at the OCSP responder an OCSP request associated with a digital certificate generated by the server" at [0393];

"creating by the OCSP responder, a Lightweight Directory Access Protocol database query based on the received OCSP request" at [0119] and [0394];

"sending by the OCSP responder the Lightweight Directory Access Protocol database query to the certificate database to determine whether the digital certificate is valid" at [0119];

"receiving at the OCSP responder a database query result indicating whether the digital certificate matches a corresponding certificate entry stored in one of the certificate database records" at [0397].

"determining, by the OCSP responder, the validity of the digital certificate based on the database query result" at [0394];

"notify the server of the determined validity of the digital certificate." at [0399]

Claims 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Wohlmacher ("Digital Certificates: a Survey of Revocation Methods"), hereinafter referred to as "Wohlmacher".

As per claim 14, Wohlmacher teaches a data processing system for answering online certificate status requests without certificate revocation lists, comprising:

· "a first computer having: a memory having program instructions; a processor configured to execute the program instructions to receive an online certificate status protocol request associated with a digital certificate" at page 114, Col. 1, 2nd paragraph;

· "create a database query based on the received request, send the database query to determine whether the digital certificate is valid, and receive a database query result indicating whether the digital certificate is valid" at page 114, Col. 1, 2nd paragraph;

· "and a second computer representing a directory server having: a database storing database records indicating digital certificates; a memory having program instructions; a processor configured to execute the program instructions to receive, from a certificate authority, an indication of a new digital certificate upon issuance of the new digital certificate, store a database record reflecting an identity of the new digital certificate, receive the database query based on the online certificate status protocol request from the first computer, search the database for a database record reflecting an identity of the requested digital certificate; and return an indication of the database record to the first computer when the database record reflecting the requested digital certificate is found to indicate validity of the requested digital certificate" at page 113, Col. 1, 2nd paragraph.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY